

**DISINTEGRATION**



**OF THE SYSTEM**

**GIORGIO FREDA**

## Index

"Disintegration of the System", Giorgio 'Fracà' Freda

"Disintegration of Freda", a repost to Freda

## DISINTEGRATION OF THE SYSTEM

GIORGIO FREDÀ

### Part 1 – Analysis

"It is inevitable that in this world of exploiters and exploited, no greatness is possible that was not ultimately made with economics. We have two opposed species of man, of arts and morals, but it is not necessary to have very much finesse to perceive that the source that feeds it is unique. It is also of the same type of progress where the protagonists of economic struggle find their justification. They meet in the fundamental pretension of everyone being a true factor of social prosperity, by which everyone is convinced of being able to undermine the positions of the adversary when he succeeds in contesting every right that is presented as such."

The fundamental reason that lead us to gather this Congress is determined by a profound conviction – mine and yours – that the present moment imposes on our organization the requirement of "closing ranks" around central motifs of our vision of life and the world. The requirement, in the first place, of recognizing what are really the points of reference and the canon from which we derive our political presence, to distinguish the ideal direction to assume. In second place, – or better, consequently and simultaneously – the requirement of articulating in a flexible group, agile, without complexes, without inhibitions – in one word: without prejudice – our vocation, our will of political struggle.

We find ourselves in the moment where the necessity of accounting for our past errors, of understanding the deep reasons that permitted them, cutting through with the need to dive into our roots – "our" roots, that is to say those men who avow a politics without mental reservations, without equivocal intentions, without petite bourgeois alibis, but with, to thus say, the impersonal soul of he who accomplishes his own duty because he must accomplish it – at the center of our political doctrine, and to remain attached to essential things, without hesitation. A lucid adherence to the essential must permit, or later, consolidate our capacity to remain agile and flexible with what is functional and instrumental. I believe in effect that there's nothing new to say in support, that the more we are rooted at the center, the more we can easily move on the points of the far circumference, without moving away – from what is important, from the essential – of the center.

I said firstly: close ranks, to give life to a flexible political organization. I want to now add: close ranks to possess a political organization able to give a helping hand to the men destined for conquest and power.

We have thus walked along a path until now. We should not fear the consequences of self-criticism when it is free and dignified and that is why we will say: we declined! We rest passively united with "others," with the political schemes of "others", with the false problems of "others," with the ideological claims of "others:" he have recolonized our final ends- that were, at least, equivocally – with "others." The comportment of all – firstly the leaders, and, then, the partisans – were, in the best hypothesis, naive, in the worst, obtuse.

Our political discourse was focused, from the start, on Europe, and we would believe that Europe was truly a myth and represented an authentic idea-force: while much later we only convinced ourselves that this word reflected a simple geographic definition, with which it was not allowed to have an original propaganda value in an epoch where even the tobacco stores, laundries, snack bars, and the hotels of spa resorts all call themselves "Europe!"

We have spoken of the European political conception opposed to the different nationalist petty patriotic conceptions, but we have never took care (or we never wanted to realize?) that we cannot have value from the side of the petite bourgeois nationalist right- especially with us – and consequently, all exhausted terms of an "indifferentist" polemic (it has also been surpassed, henceforth, since the neo-fascist kids themselves shout: Europe-Fascism- Revolution!) We have spoken in terms of "European civilization," without even scratching the surface of this expression and without verifying it, going to the depths of the problem, if there exists, in reality, a homogeneous European civilization and what are the authentic coefficients of its meaning in light of a global historical situation in which the Latin American guerrilla adheres much better to our vision of the world than the Spaniard vassal to priests and the USA (1); where the warrior people of North Vietnam, with a Spartan, sober, heroic style are far closer to our conception of existence than the Italian digestive tract, or the French or German of the West (2); where the Palestinian terrorist is far closer to our dreams of vengeance than the Jewish or Judaized Englishman (European? I doubt it). (3)

We have fought for European hegemony, by addressing ourselves to a Europe that was henceforth Americanized and Sovietized, without considering that this Europe had become the slave of the USA and the USSR, because the European nations and peoples were absorbed – following the military defeat, but not as a consequence of this defeat – into the ideological exports of the USA and the USSR. Without considering that the political, economic, cultural collapse had intervened exactly because having ended this tension, it had collapsed, this support that had aroused in some peoples, among some European men, in certain historical epochs (only among some men in some determined historical epochs!), this superior dimension of civilization that we pretended to attribute to Europe without qualification.

The moment has come to end with entertaining ourselves with the puppet "Europe" and chanting its name.

We have nothing to do with the Illuminist Europe. We have nothing to see with the mercantile Europe, with the Europe of plutocratic colonialism: nothing to share. We only have accounts to settle with the Jewish or Judaized Europe.

However, when we speak in terms of "European civilization," we consider all that: do not tell me that we speak also of that: we speak, unfortunately, only of that! Or, maybe, we want to see something else?

However. If we do not want to see another thing, of this "other" until now, we have never really and completely spoken. And I am sure that if we had truly considered and possessed this "other," we would not have provided this content a container or, better an etiquette, or still better, a "brand name" represented by the word "EUROPE."

Having grown such and such impure compositions, to push back, to bury; have intervened such – I dare say: too many – factors that have altered and corrupted this European liquid to the point of making it manure, it can still positively undergo processes of separation. Europe is an old hussy who has whored in all the brothels and has contracted all the ideological infections – since those of revolts of medieval communes to those of anti-imperial national monarchies; from Illuminism to Jacobinism, to Masonry, to Judaism, to Zionism, to liberalism, to Marxism. A whore, whose womb has conceived and engendered the bourgeois revolution and the proletarian revolt: whose soul was possessed by the violence of merchants and the rebellion of slaves. And us, right now, we would like to redeem it, by whispering the magic words: by saying, for example, that we must give to the "Europeans" exclusively ... from Brest to Bucharest?! (4)

We have raised the flag of Europe without being able to stand for any viable and homogeneous meaning: without seeing the number of its sons and the knots that compose its torn tissue and how much excrement it hides!

We preferred, in summation, to hide our incapacity to choose what that was authentic and true to us and to know to reject what is impure and equivocal there within the European tradition (that is to say, in this case, historically), by having the illusion of filling in such a void by recourse to the formula, the word "Europe"; without considering, as I said at the start, that it is a democratic bourgeois or democratic socialist Europe; all as existed yesterday a Fascist or Nazi Europe; all as existed before yesterday a Jacobin and Counter-Revolutionary Europe. Without considering that many people, including the technocrats of the ECC, dream of a Europe in their manner: a Europe founded on a sinister hierarchy that imposed at the base of the pyramid the "rational" exploitation of Italian labor, and, at the summit, the investment of international capital.

In place of adopting this equivocal formula (which should only serve to distinguish us from those who support other formulas – the nationalist formulas – all as equivocal), it was necessary to say by name what principles, around what vision of the world, according to what direction of effectiveness, the best of the European men should engage in a "supernational organic political unity." That is this other reality that we could still give the name "Europe.", if the "old Europe," the Europe of obscure centuries (to reverse the meaning of a phrase known by an old clown), the Europe of anti-imperial communes, the Europe of the Roman Church, the Protestant Europe, of mercantilism, of Illuminism, of proletarian and bourgeois democracy, the Judaic and Masonic Europe, if this monstrous specter was never presented before these men of a very different race.

I am stopping myself on this point, because it represents the most evident character of our errors and because the motif of Europe constituted, in the years of political activity of our organization, the focal point towards which our political perspectives flowed. I thus hold it useless to stop to specifically consider the other elements of our program, from the moment that they also have consequences, on the distinct plans, of these equivocations already mentioned.

Now, after having recognized our myopia and our errors, it is necessary to proceed, before verifying the direction to assume, to analyze the situation today and the operational criteria that follow the others. I continue to say "the others" – and not our adversaries or our enemies – exactly because they want to insist and clarify up to the most extreme representations that words can create or images evoke, how much between us and the others there is (and there should be) much more than simple difference of mentality, the fashion of acting, political ideology. It is a different soul, it is another race that gives our actions their typical meaning and gives them a proper physiognomy, irreducible to figures and the common terms of different political ideologies of our epoch.

The consideration that we leave is this: we live today in a world of others, surrounded by others, by these dignified representatives of the bourgeois epoch, under the domination of the most miserable and most demeaning of dictatorships: the bourgeois dictatorship, that of the merchants. All that surrounds us is bourgeois: political society, economics, culture, family, social mannerisms, religious manifestations.

In "Western" democracies, the spectacle presented to us is linked by a revolting coherence to the most orthodox canons of the bourgeois conception of life. In these democracies, the state is used to maintain stability, by the intermediary of all its repressive and oppressive instruments, the hegemonic relation of a class – the class of the bourgeoisie and, particularly, a part of that, the part that constitutes a plutocratic oligarchy – on the people. The exclusively classist support on which it is based does not admit realities and values other than economic realities and values: the bourgeois dictatorship victoriously emerging according to processes of reinforcement and hegemonic intensification since the French Revolution (\*), now unalterable for about one hundred years the only relation that links the bourgeoisie to man: the relation of master to slave, exploiter to exploited. Despite all the sweeteners of assistance, of foresight, in general paternalism, here is the reality of the bourgeois regime.

This is even the reality that Marx, in 1849 already, described magisterially in the Communist Manifesto: "The political power of today of the modern state is only an administrative junta of common businesses of the entire bourgeois class ... Everywhere where it has come to domination, it destroyed all those conditions of life, that were feudal, patriarchal, idyllic. It destroyed without pity all those multicolored links, which in the feudal regime brought men closer to their natural superiors, and only left between man and other men those links of immediate self interest and the merciless payment of accounts... It transformed personal dignity into a simple value of exchange; and to the numerous and different liberties well acquired and consecrated by documents, it substituted the sole and unique liberty of commerce, with a hard and pitiless conscience."

If bourgeois society (\*\*) concedes to the dominated (to the subjugated!) an amelioration of conditions of vegetative life (by including here even those of the mental domain!), that is not the exclusive selfish-economic premises on which it is founded that came to be missed. He usually say exactly that the "devil" is all the more dangerous when he becomes more respectable! And, in effect, the greatest well being should have consequently made in the historical development of bourgeois society, the tendencies of political hegemony of a part of the bourgeoisie, consolidated in a politically effective "abuse of power," simply assume different modes of force than the preceding ruling classes, and the expressions in its coherent manifestations are of the same identical reality: reality enclosed, exactly, in the schemes of production – consumption tension.

The capitalist, thus understands that by raising the salary of the worker, the latter will buy a fridge or an automobile produced by the capitalist; the boss realizes that by stunning those who work with the obsession of always needing new things– and for the same unreal, illusory, artificial – and constraining him by the preoccupation of acquiring them, he can completely intoxicate the worker with work. Thus the latter, gentle and happy, tranquil as a cow ( a cow that, periodically, can roar for salary claims; which, sometimes, can even give the illusion of being a wild bull and can damage the stable!), undertakes no attempt to substitute its own hegemony for that of the bourgeoisie.

Consequently, the state of bourgeois “representative” democracies is only the political forum of the bourgeoisie; its unique function and real destination are determined by the bourgeois economy, in the sublimation of the bourgeois economy. Aided by the means of penetration that technical applications of bourgeois science offer, the bourgeoisie, after having reduced man to the level of the worker, succeeded in completing the process of cross-identification of the “individual” and the “social” and filling each domain with its presence. The merchant imposed on all his own inclinations, his own aspirations: different, foreign (we do not say superior, only different) vocations possessing no margin in the political space of the bourgeoisie, that belongs solely to he who is “bourgeois.”

Art itself, despite the hypocritical justification (or dignification?) of the schemes of autonomy that the bourgeois care to attribute to it, is rigorously used for the pleasure ( or better, for intellectual masturbation) of the bourgeois (5). “Free” science is only another thing that researches for the progress of the bourgeois civilization, that is to say the reinforcement of bourgeois society: it is only an effective technology serving the “conquests” of bourgeois civilization.

Justice itself is only another crystallization into the law codes of the ideas that dominate within bourgeois society, ideas of the “arrogant” class that is the bourgeois class. Any wrong note, any dysfunction of the system is attributed by it to sabotage committed by enemies of the system, by the rare men for whom the order simply is not an idol to adore, for whom the legalistic sublimation only represents profound and demeaning injustice.

When by chance, finally, all these coefficients of equilibrium do not suffice, bourgeois society puts in function its principal and decisive safety valve, sports, phenomena of mass transference, of deviance, exhausting the remaining energy towards a still exciting, near demonic objective (7).

Besides that, if the economy is the destiny of the bourgeoisie, it is, in the same fashion, the destiny of the poor, that is to say, the exploited, meaning, the proletariat.



It is not even from another reality, or a different fetish, that the proletarians begin the assault from the bourgeois refectory. It is the raging conscience of not wanting to serve the bourgeoisie any longer, not wanting to fatten their fortunes, that provokes the proletarian revolt (8).

If the bourgeoisie recite the "leitmotiv" of equality, as a juridical – cultural – sentimental concept, the proletarians do not content themselves with "good intentions," but require that the formula, by becoming a means of concrete action, eliminates the distinction between he who has and he who has not, or between those who possess more and those who possess less. However, the economic and quantitative premises remain! It is always in the name of economic reality, it is always under the effects of the mystic delirium of the economy that the proletariat tends to impose its articulation of economic relations, its organization of justice, its fashion of conceiving – by way of consequences – artistic production, relations between citizens, etc. ...

The apparent antithesis between bourgeois democracies and socialist (\*) democracies dissolves – like a wall of ice – in the face of this characteristic dominance of production and consumption.

Priority which, in bourgeois democracies, is represented by he who has economic power and, consequently, political power (he who possess, commands), is constituted in socialist democracies by he who has political power and has, consequently, at his disposal – as a unique privilege of his politically commanding function – these same means of production that, in the so-called "opposing" camp, form the property of the bourgeoisie.

On one side, the holders of capital, who possess – in the name of liberty, justice, order – the political power and aim to keep it, that is to say to increase it to increase their capital; on the other, the sole holders of capital, who, by using different branding, advertise the same product. The economic structure of the abnormal processes of production-consumption are thus present in the two cases (\*).

It is not the moment to analyze – even briefly- the imperialist implications of these systems, whose logic necessarily poses, exactly, the solution of an imperialist assault as a means of protection, unique and fatal, of the capitalist system.

It is thus not astonishing if, like all in bourgeois society, in socialist society as well, the functions of power are qualified and expressed exclusively in terms of wealth; could it be anything else when we attribute to the state the sole function of counter of wealth (besides, what different state could the bourgeois and socialist themselves better establish?): when the function of the state is aroused by wealth, to seize wealth and to propose exclusively the satisfaction of the physical needs of vegetative existence (inevitably also, we will repeat, in the term "physical," these disturbing complications that the bourgeoisie satisfy themselves to designate as "spiritual" needs).

In the two models, consequently, the identical phenomena only admit, by alternation, "blurred images." Tension opposing the bourgeoisie and proletarians on one part, tension opposing the bureaucrats (technocrat functionaries) to the governed on the part.

On one side, private property is not included in the state (that is to say that it is not limited to represent one of the organizing coefficients of the state), but is the state itself, the state is the "property of the propertied"; on the other, the property of the state resolves itself in the property of those who administer the state, so well that the state and abstract equality resolve in a bureaucratic and technocratic prevarication.

At this point, it would be ridiculous to oppose to this analysis the subtle "distinction" according to which an identity regarding the form of results between the two forms of organization – the bourgeois and the socialist – would not correspond to a substantial identity in the form of "principles." According to which, while the exploiter-exploited relation would be the typical and normal consequence, necessarily deriving from the premises of the bourgeois capitalist system, the exploitation of the governed by the government in the socialist capitalist system should be qualified by abnormal dysfunction and degeneration not imputable to the essence of the same system (9)! The truth, on the contrary, is that the essence of the two phenomena is the same, because the principles are the same: economy is the destiny of man, the unique elemental reality- the essential – of man, his sole existential dimension. And this "primordial reality," having at its center the eternal image of the digestive tract (a tube with two openings: one to swallow and another to evacuate, other eventual openings only serve to embellish it or facilitate "good digestion" and the stimulate gastric secretions, when that is necessary) admits, however, two different interpretations of voracity: one, according to which all digestive tracts are equal (\*); the other, according to which all the guts are not equal, but some fat and others very narrow (and that is why it is necessary that justice, order, etc, etc ... ensure that a dangerous and subversive "expansion" does not happen). (\*\*)

## Part 2 – The Physiognomy of the Authentic State

"One day the workers will live like the bourgeoisie but below them, poorer and more simply, there will be a superior caste. That is who will possess power."

There is still, however, those who do not allow themselves to be possessed by the seductions of the economy and remain firm in the conviction that the primordial task of the state is not to guarantee the acquisition or the maintenance of a fridge, of a washing machine, or greater weekly hobbies. There are those who are convinced, because he believes that the goal of man is not the maintain himself, vegetate, and satisfy himself, that it is another thing: that it is even exactly this other thing that gives meaning and style to existence, and that, precisely from this other thing, it's worth the effort of deproletarianizing himself and de-bourgeoisifying himself, by exhausting the framework of conditioning determined by the existence of physical needs in the parts and the least important regions of the human being.

It is to this truly free race of men – to the ascetics, in the classic sense of the term, of politics – that we propose a dialogue around the true state and the function of the free and just man in the state: with the intention not of presenting a vague and sentimental entity, but orienting towards the subtle intuition of the myth –and even the mystery – of the state.

We do not search for the state on the basis of empirical inquiry leading to the phenomena of the state existing today; we will attempt to seize the state not as a historical phenomenon – the State *hic et nunc* – from a "phenomenological" point of view, but we want to understand it in the absolute: as a value, that is to say, as reality that holds true *pro aeternitate*. A reality that, considering in itself, has no need of manifestation, historical support (the existing state), to be valuable. In other terms, we want to seize the essence of the idea of the state that illuminates, judging if these phenomena (the historical states) are better or worse applications in relation to this canon.

The indications that follow do not derive from our personal ideology (by admitting that we have one), they convince us that we have the rigorous truth according to which " an idea cannot be new, because the truth is not a product of the human spirit, but it exists independently of us and all that we have ever known."

Taking what we have said higher, our myth of the state is not held to be a utopia, if by utopia we mean, in effect, that which cannot be realized or exist, the fruit of overly cerebral and intellectual conception.

The myth of the state is the myth of a political order that, without lower itself to any particular time and space, "is" eternal, and eternally proposed as true.\*

The principles of the true state, by recovering the domain of "should be", assume an eminently normative character and, as such, are not verified by recognition or agreement, by the decided refusal of those who live in the historical world. They issue from a metapolitical and metahistorical level consequently autonomous in relation to the forms of empirical political existence: it is on the contrary these forms which, in order not become abstractions, are "forms of something "real," and should exist by function of these principles.

The meaning of the true state depends on the animating tension that it inspires in the individual microcosm, such that he represents a real center of power and not an inert superstructure. The true state does not propose as its authentic goal economic wealth and well being for all its citizens or a lone social group, but what the ancient Greeks lucidly defined in terms of "felicity" – eudaimonia – of harmony of the different components of the body of the state. "Felicity" in the sense of accomplishment, integration, and participation with the superhuman and divine elements of reality.

In the true state there must be the guarantee of organic unity of the social body, unity that must not be understood as intrusion of the state into the pretend domain of the private interests of the citizen, but as the constitution of a climate of ideal social tension, where each is abiding at his post, following his own inclinations with coherence, fidelity, and liberty. Thus it is not admissible, in this state, that someone commits prevarications and abuses, which amounts to injuring others: on the contrary, it must maintain a will lucid and conscious of following an existence conforming to its proper nature.

Evidently, when we attribute to the state ( or better, when we recognize in the state) the function of fostering this climate that, alone, makes possible a regime of ordered life, we do not want to consider the state as a means of activity generating "virtue" – in the modern and moralistic meaning of the term-as a pure element "functioning" in the soul of man. The true state, on the contrary, must be understood as a reality in contact with all that we propose, in a conditioned fashion, as individual morality, objective, settling into these terms a free ethic of these characters of "virtue" that we attribute today to morality.

The true state is not the fruit of an ideology or an individual political conception, but the responsible realization in terms of the political regime of an impersonal principle, of a norm that we could define "a priori," leading – as we exactly had said – to this "natural right of heroic races," where the signification of nature does not end with the functional, physical element, but acquires value by the "normative" word, symbol of all "normal" and integrated conditions of existence. A canon that represents the "internal dressing", the absolute formula of a lifestyle accomplished with fidelity to that what it really is.

The true state do not constitute a simple structure of positive rights, but is in essence and in function superior: the spirit of the state, the center of the state is represented by a power that transcends the plan that is immediately earthly and simply human.

The true state holds as an organizing principle of a reconquest that man must do: the reconquest of the higher-world, the reestablishment of his heroic dimension. Consequently, the true state represents the necessary element of mediation that provokes the reintegration of the citizen into divine reality: it is only through its intermediary that the citizen realizes exceeding his own individual existence, by opening a reality that, such as it is autonomous, transcends it.

We do not say that this image of the political regime, developed in a final and coherent fashion, can receive the accusation of usurping "religious" qualities and dimensions, by obligating man – who feels this tension towards the divine – to deviate from his own direction – that would be, according to the accusation, the religious direction – to orient him towards the secular direction, indicated by the state (that state, consequently, would constitute the substitute of functions, that legitimately, would not devolve to it.)

The response to the accusation emerges in the clear fashion of the same terms in which it is formulated, deformed: it comes from making a quasi-ontological rupture – the we should refuse in a decided way – between the said secular domain of the state and the abstract "spiritual" plan, made autonomous in relation to the first. A rupture by which the intrinsic divine values of the human condition, would become simple moral elements, shadowed in the equivocation of the "world of conscience," while the human elements, unbound from these divine potentialities, would only become profane and secular.

No gap, on the contrary, should exist between the order of values and the plan of the true state (\*), because if we make one a stranger to the other, we break an organically unitary reality: we arrive only at the decomposed results of internalizing, in the emotive and moralist style, in a pretend "human conscience," in values, and we subtract from the public order these characteristics that can only qualify it and legitimize it.

In the true state we cannot objectively pose terms of the priority of the individual in relation to the state or consider, on the other hand, it on him, because the reality of the true state is not separated from the reality of the individual by no difference of structure (more than two realities, we should speak of two coefficients of a unique reality, the two aspects of the same phenomenon, unresolved in substantial continuity). Subsisting solely between them a functional difference of possibility, intensity, given that the state represents the center of "necessary" tension for the citizen to become "happy."

On the other hand, in the true state there are no longer "individuals", but men-members of the state; men animated by an ethic of super-personal life, each differentiated by the responsibility of various ranks, a distinct responsibility, a different duty, a degree of various liberty according to organic articulations. These men are engaged as the object of the work of the state and their perfection is the ends to which the order of the state is destined. Only that qualifies the existence of man in the state; only that, in an analogous fashion, constitutes the legitimization of the state that must cultivate, sustain, and support the dispositions of those who are bound to it.

Thus, only in the true state, men participate in the destiny of the state and acquire its power, that is a non human force. They feels its signification, that is supernatural; they nourish themselves in its reality, that is a superior reality. We repeat: it is the true state that determines the direction to follow and "ordains" the moments across which man attains his "authentic" goal, that consists of participation in the divine.

In addition, it is the true state that proposes to each man the recognition of his own irreducible function, of his proper place, of his proper nature, the insertion into the just relations of superiority and inferiority: in a word, the recognition of its proper freedom. And that is not negative liberty that manifests itself externally, liberty turned towards utility and "particularity," that is to say the only liberty that we can conceive today and that, resolving in undifferentiated and egalitarian terms, develops according to the directions of rebellion. But it is a qualitative and differentiated freedom, typical of the person whose value is inherent. Freedom that does not derive, as we said, from abstract facts and simply being elementary man, but that is measured by the stature, by the dignity of each. That is capable of realizing its own possibilities and adhering to its own particular perfection on the interior of the political framework of the state. Ultimately, freedom that means internal discipline and respect of its own qualitatively hierarchical plan.

After these indications we would like to conclude, and in concluding, reaffirm the idea of the state, these processes that tend to penetrate the mystery of the state, cannot unfold according to simply logical values, but by the intermediary of lucid reference to metaphysical values, inherent in the essence of the idea of the state, to its core not belonging to the domain of things subjected to the bonds of becoming.

To reaffirm the reality of that which is sacred and divine and the sacrality of that which is the real political structure should constitute the support of the true state: because if a state, if a political regime is not legitimized by the fact of possessing a spiritual force, by proposing spiritual ends, it represents nothing organic and central: but will only be an inert, materialist, and social structure, resulting from its own rigidity to all organisms without vital forces.

### Part 3 -The Necessity of an Operative Method

"Class is only a bourgeois category: in the attempt to conceive by classist means working revolutionary requirements, we indicate an expediency that the bourgeoisie have used in seeking to postpone, in the world and in the social framework of society, the representations of a new humanity, by a regime of transactions, compromises, and negotiations."

Now, after having traced – by taking its elementary lines- the physiognomy of the true state, we should consider what political work is imposed on us in order to actively testify to our adherence to the image of the true state. It is not acceptable, even partially, to hold the hypothesis of those who, by cultivating this image ("the model fixed in the heavens" said Plato) in a solely rational fashion, support the necessity of remaining attached to looking at the collapse of the associative forms (that, more effectively, we could call them formula) that are expressed in today's political reality. For them, effectively, the myth of the state becomes a utopia – contemplated in an overly intellectual fashion – : for them, detachment truly represents the alibi destined to mask uncertainty, incapacity, and fear.

For the sterile apologists of "discourse" on the state, in fact, all action in political terms would be nearly a fall in rank, a descent towards compromise...: they have no idea of the state, but at most, a concept of the state, well hidden in their mental folds. Consequently, we do not take into consideration these adorers of abstractions and the logic of the inevitable, these champions of intellectual testimonials! For us, to be faithful to our vision of the world – and thus the state – means to conform to it, leaving nothing untouched to realize it historically: and certainly not to manifest ideological devotion and contentment with this cerebral coherence.

And then, by developing this premise, we should affirm the condition – not sufficient, however, necessary – in order to pose the elements of the foundation of the true state, the SUBVERSION of all that exists today as a political system.

It is necessary by promoting, goading, accelerating the time of this destruction, intensifying the action of rupture from the present equilibrium and today's phase of political arrangement. It is necessary to watch for those eventual means, the potential forces that should determine the short circuiting of the nervous centers of this bourgeois civilization not absorbed or integrated by one of the so numerous possibilities of ossification offered by the bourgeois system.

Consequently, we should inevitably transfer our considerations from the plan of recognizing principles to the operative plan: from the plan of what is valuable to the plan of what is effective, to adjust the miserable "reality" (that we should more exactly qualify as "unreality") of the historical period where we live to the authentic "reality."

The march to follow (we repeat it here) must be this: rigid firmness in the essential and maximum flexibility in the functional plan.

We have indicated above what we should, according to us, hold as essential. We have already considered the necessity of discovering a plan to hold solidly and a style that we must cultivate. We have already supported the principle by which our political action must essentially develop from and articulate to the men of tendencies, vocations, and characters close to ours: people who have the same ideas of the state as us. At present, in the coalition of men – that we cannot create, but that we can only recognize and strengthen – we have chosen to struggle in the world of bourgeois democracies, to these men that refuse as foreign to their style an equivocal function of intellectual "devotion", for us, we must propose to these men a definitive objective of struggle: the destruction of the bourgeois world. That is to say we must convince them that they are poorly represented by incurably bourgeois society: that no therapy is possible, that henceforth a surgical operation would not even be effective, that it is necessary to accelerate the hemorrhaging and bury the corpse. We must persuade them that nothing we can construct wouldn't go to ruins; that the fundamental premise to construct the true state is the demolition of the residual forms and surviving structures of the bourgeois regimes.

There will be, certainly, the fearful, the artless, and the incapable, those who demand guarantees "after the fact", to the control of successive reactions to the disappearance of bourgeois regimes. Those who, fearing the leap into the fog (and by holding, evidently, the possession of true light) believe it possible to use the glue to reattach and prolong it, in one manner or another, with the aid of vague correctives.



To those we must respond that it is not the moment to ask how to maintain the discourse "of afterwards" The discourse of "afterwards" is presented as real in the measure where we can predict a rigorous method for afterwards, without allowing seduction by messianic solutions. And the discourse on the method afterwards must be traced solely in reference to concrete situations that will appear, that is to say on historical hypotheses. He who is persuaded – and it is a visceral conviction! – that the destruction of bourgeois society forcibly implies the foundation of the proletarian state (or better associative forms different than it), can only earn the recognition suitable for idiots and the superficial. He who realizes, without being conscious of being it, is complicit with the forces that pretend today to perpetuate the bourgeois equilibrium; without wanting to understand, exactly, how the hegemonic bourgeois equilibrium had only two centuries of life and how clear the symptoms are that demonstrate it has entered into a twilight phase and that it is in the process of exhausting its own ability to endure.

However, it is not towards them, but towards the other companions on the route that we turn our attention: towards those who have perfectly grasped that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are both results – or better, dross – of a unique process begun with the decomposition of the organic state; that both represent the faces of the same coin; that both constitute interdependent realities. Thus they have drawn the conclusion that the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are necessary terms, one facing the other, of the internal relation which is assured by the equilibrium of this society. That neither of the two terms can survive disassociated from the other. That the "social question" appeared then as the bourgeoisie – becoming a class in the proper sense of the term – constituted its own dictatorship. The ancient world and the forms of organization of the state that were born in that epoch were experienced by the rich and the poor: but both recognized the dignity of men; while modern societies and times only know exploiters and exploited: and have imposed the slavery of money on both.

It is tiring to repeat, but if this repetition can suit the ends of explanation, we repeat: the bourgeoisie and the proletariat are elements integrated into one another; that one appeals to the other; only the difference of qualitative order separates one from the other. And us, if from one side we refuse to distill the sweat of those who work to sublimate them and produce the smoke of incense, we do not want to support and exalt the glands that secrete this sweat any longer.

The solutions that we intend to propose concern the method to adopt will be outlined in the following part. They are limited, voluntarily, to determining the elements of organization of the state, that is to say to consider the reality of the state in one of its moments : that of the regimentation of the elementary relations of life between the citizens.

Between the orientations that follow and the preceding indications, representatives of what we have defined as the reality of the true state, maintain an organic coherence, even if it seems paradoxical the fact that we want to adopt an order that is thus called communist and simultaneously, supporting the value of the organic state and hierarchical order. It is profoundly true, on the contrary, the hierarchy does not mean oligarchy at all; that the organic state does not mean liberty for the bourgeoisie and exploitation for the proletariat; for those who understood well, order is not determined by the equilibrium of consumption offered by the bourgeois system. It is above all true that the two last centuries of bourgeois dictatorship have made us understand how much the desire for material wealth, the impulsion to hegemony based on the wealth of goods, have been factors of unsupportable aberrations, alienating situations, demeaning suffering by the men of the latter centuries.

Previously, we declared that we intend to propose orientations that serve to define the structures of the state in its moments or goals: those that aim to harmonize the economic relations between the citizens and order the sphere of their "socialization" (judicial, educational relations etc...). Besides that, the fact is that we want to consider an objective that is not certainly the first among those proper to the state but that only justifies itself in instrumental terms in relation to dominant ends (\*): this fact, exactly, demonstrates insupportable character of the accusation of ideological syncretism, that reproaches the acceptance of the egalitarian premises and the typical collectivism of socialist democracies. Or better, it is truly necessary to explain that the fact to assume communist criteria in the domain of material goods does not mean at all adherence to the conditions of Marxist socialism?

Material wealth- all material wealth – must be property of the state because it serves the state in its moment of organization; because the state must be unbound from these preoccupations, it is necessary to guarantee it space free from these prevarications that the retention of wealth in the hands of an oligarchical group with economic power inevitably causes.

#### Part 4 -The Organization of the Popular State

"The important thing is not that a new class comes to power, but a new humanity, at the same level of all the other figures of history, fulfilled according to the typical meaning of the space of power. For that, we have refused to see the worker as the representative of a new class, of a new "society", or a new economy. Or the worker is nothing, or something more than all that: the representative of a determinant figure, which acts according to its own laws, follows its own vocation, participates in a particular freedom...

The life of the worker will be autonomous, the direct expression of its being, and consequently, sovereignty, or better it will have nothing other than the effort of ensuring the departure of the camp of old rights and insipid pleasures of an extinguished era."

For the organization of the popular state, the elimination of private property under all its forms will be necessary, the sole exceptions being represented by individual consumable goods.

Property should only be public and particular goods will become part of the patrimony of the state.

In the domain of industrial production, the extinction of particular private enterprises will be followed by the appearance of concentrations of enterprises, differentiated on the territorial level, according to the objectives of production.

In each enterprise the COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT will function, formed by all the workers of the enterprise. The committee of management will periodically name the COMMISSAR OF THE ENTERPRISE, with the function (duties and powers) of coordinating all activity of the enterprise.

The Commissar of the Enterprise will be responsible for his acts before the Regional Committee of Management and Organization (the regional presidium).

In the domain of agricultural production, the dissolution of small and large landowners existing today, will be succeeded by the organic constitution of AGRICULTURAL COMBINES, territoriality differentiated according to the requirements of production.

The workers of the soil will constitute THE COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT OF THE COMBINE. This enterprise will name the COMMISSAR OF THE COMBINE, with analogous functions to those of the commissar of the enterprise.

In the field left free by that which is today is defined as the "activity of commerce," CENTERS OF CONSUMPTION will be formed, territoriality articulated in the fashion of representing a link between each industrial and agricultural unit and the beneficiaries of these consumer products.

The functioning of this organ will be made possible by the application of criteria analogous to those indicated for the structure of the industrial enterprise and the agricultural combine.

The operative units represented by Industrial Enterprises, Agricultural Combines, and Centers of Consumption, articulated in organic territorial units, will converge – on the level of each region – in the REGIONAL PRESIDIUM, the organ that should coordinate the different activities and guarantee the functional equilibrium of the regional unit.

At the national level the POLITICAL PRESIDIUM OF THE STATE will function, whose members will be chosen by the different regional presidia.

Periodically the Political Presidium of the State will choose the REGENT OF THE STATE. He will exercise his own functions by coordinating the activities of STATE COMMISSARS (officials of industry, agriculture, consumption, financial affairs, popular education, foreign affairs, popular justice, the popular militia).

The Commissars of the State, chosen by the Regent of the State from those who will be proposed by the Presidium of the State, will have the tasks of surveillance and collaboration with the Commissars of Enterprise, Combines, and Consumption in each minor territorial unit and with the members of each Regional Presidium.

The political economy of the popular state will be guided by criteria essentially opposed to those in force in the present economies of the capitalist type (market economies). Today's relation of production-consumption (whose expansionist and pathological character of production arouses and exasperates consumption) will be completely overturned, with the attribution of the preeminent function to the PROGRAM OF THE GOODS OF CONSUMPTION in relation to production.

The same relation – made objectively more flexible and functional by consideration of the objective to attain – is valued as a reference for the use of exchanges with foreigners.

FINANCIAL AFFAIRS. The total of banking institutions – today in force in the economies of the capitalist type – will be eliminated.

A STATE BANK will be constituted – under the direction of the State Commissar for financial affairs – with the task of guaranteeing the functional equilibrium of the Popular State's economy in each sector of production, consumption, and foreign exchange (it is evident that the function assumed by the State Bank takes no character of credit lending).

The State Bank will coin the money of the state, whose power to purchase will be exclusively guaranteed by the economic wealth of the Popular State.

POPULAR EDUCATION. It is necessary to say first that this expression does not represent – in the most absolute fashion – the humanist – classist – scientific character that has infected the education in force in the countries where the bourgeoisie class dominates.

Today's Italian scholarly structure will be destroyed without reserve nor exception. Academic titles will be abolished.

The constant and rigid criteria of the direction which the Popular State should adhere to in this domain of activity can be summarized by the following formula: "SCHOOL as PREPARATION for WORK." Once the humanist and scientific superstructures are eliminated, school will be rigorously functional, so that scholarly formation will be subordinated to the productive requirements of the Popular State.

In the popular state there will be no place for the abstract and intellectualist culture of the bourgeoisie type. The school, consequently, should take a differentiated and flexible structure, in the fashion of immediately and adequately reacting to the impulses that the Popular State excites in it.

Once the unitary and common to all courses of study are ended, there will be no permission of a particular student to "choose" – arbitrarily and selfishly – the types of study that please him. It will be, on the contrary, the Popular State that determines, in relation to the economic equilibrium of the state, what "operative notions" should be known by the student-member of the Popular State.

In a reduced measure, the family will be charged by the Popular State to accomplish the tasks of education towards the young members of the Popular State.

The constitution of "Houses of the Youth" for the youth of 8 to 20 years, complementary to operative territorial economic units (industrial enterprises, combines, centers) and the functioning of similar institutes for the members of the Popular State less than 8 will be determinant to organically obtain this objective.

The births of the young members of the Popular State will be rigorously planned in relation to the functional equilibrium of the Popular State.

POPULAR JUSTICE: The abolition of private property will provoke the disappearance of those forms of regimentation of individual relations summarized in what the bourgeoisie call "private law."

The administration of justice – concretely deferred to its function of making administrative order – will be exclusively directed towards the punishment of crimes committed against the Popular Order of the State, under all their manifestations (crimes committed against public property; against the popular constitution of the state; against the equilibrium of individual relations).

Today's structure and composition of the Magistracy will be abolished. Popular justice will be exercised – on the sole level of jurisdiction – by a POPULAR JUDGE designated, for each minor territorial unit, – by the Regional Presidium among those chosen by the Commissars of Enterprises, Combines, and Centers of Consumption, following their proposition by the Committees of Management concerned.

The Popular Judge will be aided by a lawyer, named by the State Commissar for Popular Justice, expert in matters of criminal law, and he will be responsible of his function before the Committees of Management and the Regional Presidium. He will obligate each member of the Popular State to report the cases and circumstances in which a Popular Judge has committed crimes in the administration of Popular Justice.

In exceptional circumstances, recourse to the Regent of the State will be permitted. No act – even one not expressly stated – of an injurious, and thus, criminal, nature to the popular order of the state will escape punishment.

Penalties will consist of forced labor; for the most grave crimes against the popular order of the state and public property, the death penalty will be expected.

The responsibility of different Committees of Management and various Commissars of Enterprise is strictly inherent in the duty of surveillance and prevention, so that those who share in their productive unit do not commit crimes. Consequently, we inflict proportional penalties on all the members of a group where a member commits crimes against the Popular State.

This principle of action provides, in a coherent fashion, structure to the Popular State, which doesn't recognize any individually autonomous reality, but only bodies or productive units within which the individual is constitutionality placed.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS: The denunciation of the Atlantic Pact and its military organization, as the rupture of relations that link Italy today the neocapitalist structures (European Economic Community, etc...) must provoke the active insertion of the Popular State into the sphere of states that refuse to be snagged by the politics of imperialist blocs of power.

The Popular State will establish alliances with all the authentically anti-capitalist states and favor on the international level, movements of struggle against capitalism and the revisionist accomplices.

POPULAR MILITIA: In the place of the different organs in the service of the bourgeois state (police, gendarmes, army, etc...) the POPULAR MILITIA will be constituted, organically and exclusively composed of volunteers, rigorously selected for various functions.

The Popular Militia are given the tasks of surveillance and prevention – internally- against the rebirth of bourgeois tendencies, having, externally, the functions of defense for the Popular State and collaboration with movements of anti-capitalist struggle.

Each territorial unit of the Popular Militia will be coordinated by a Commissar of the Militia, named by the Regional Presidium and responsible to the COMMITTEE OF THE MILITIA (composed by all the militia members of the territorial unit) and the Regional Presidium, for the accomplishment of its functions.

## Part 5 – Conclusions

"The worst evil in Italy, it's still the bourgeois: the bourgeois-priest, the bourgeois-peasant, the bourgeois-worker, the bourgeois- "mister", the bourgeois-intellectual: almost sawdust, the substance without form, in which we can distinguish neither high nor low."

Now that our discourse has touched its end, it is opportune to add what is not only destined to the men following us, our organization, but to also address the others: being those opposed to the system today after having been militant in bourgeois organizations of the neo-Fascist right, being those who push back against the present regime after having been militant in the formations (we should also qualify them in this case: bourgeois) of the revisionist left.

It addresses, among the first, above all to these friends who, although having made the same doctrinal choices as us – according to the principles of the true state – and although being close to us by their attachment to a differentiated vision of man, remain inert and disappointed following their past political activity and disconcerted by our objective choices.

To those we must also repeat that no opposition separates our doctrinal premises from our practical orientations: because they are not such different solutions that we expose in a final fashion, distinct to the plan and we utilize it and the angles of view where we place it.

To those we equally affirm that principles are not overly intellectual abstractions that report the true nature of alibis destined to hide powerlessness: but they should be valued, on the contrary, as paradigms for an action that finds a concrete realization in the order of a historically determined situation. The adherence to the principle – we repeat it – is not accomplished by conceptual formation, by rational clarification, or, in general, by mental elaborations! To adhere to the principle means to exercise an impulse towards the realization of the principle: firstly in the existential domain of each – that is to say in the sphere of character – then, (we should say: simultaneously) as attempting to accomplish the realization in the domain of the state. And that transforms any social organizations (a simply natural phenomenon, because the existence of many individuals intrinsically implies an organization, so elementary in itself) into a state – disregarding "juridical" meaning of the term- it's exactly the adherence of a community, groups of men, to an idea, to a principle, to an organic vision of life animated by this principle.



Arriving at this point, an element always acquires for us a most grand certitude: to think that no true tension that can transcribe in reality the principles of the true state will arise – and even when it arises it is aborted – is thus to remain alive in the “bearing structures” of bourgeois regimes, thus the residual components remain strong and the sources of derivation of bourgeois society (that is to say the economic substrate) remain intact. The “milieu” that draws life from must be sterilized: such is the reason for a communist economic regimentation.

What we do not oppose to this problem, the problem of the modes of destruction of the bourgeois regime, is only a contingent question and can thus be resolved in a more or less long space of time. We are also convinced that bourgeois society is neither eternal nor immortal: but it is exactly this certainty that incites us to accelerate the time of its fall and not to remain immobile and foreign to the unfolding of this phenomenon.

Regarding the pretend necessity of detachment and apolitea, some of our experiences oblige us to reveal two existing fashions or interpretations of being detached in the face of events: there is a fashion of being, the superior detachment of those who have truly attained some mountaintop (who has in effect discovered the unknown and resolved it into his own existential equation), and there is an attitude of those who only want to appear as such and manifest the detachment proper to the senseless and obtuse.

Consequently, to renounce the struggle by supporting that whose effect is intended but however does not touch the essential, when we choose the proving grounds, means to only express a sophism, the alibi of those who, constitutionally, are inclined to renunciation or who allowed themselves to be possessed by deceptions.

Moreover, who can consider as a trifling thing the struggle against the bourgeois regime? It is today a system that, as such, offers space and “freedom” to all: also, and above all, to those who are “its” dialectical opponents! Paradoxically, as long as the “opponents” or “contestants” of the bourgeois regime exist, it will burn them and digest all.

Our task, in fact, is not to limit ourselves to provoking damages or simple destruction of the regime, but to provoke the disintegration. The regime, we can compare it to one of these unicellular organisms with an elementary structure, that when cut, regrows, that mutilated, reforms: we must aim for the unique sensible and subtle organ, on which the whole gelatinous mass depends, the core, to act in this regard as antibiotics can act.

It is exactly that – the destruction of the system – our immediate historical task: it means to testify actively to the principles of the true state in our typical historical situation. It has for us the value of tension and the adherence to the elements at the base of our vision of the world: and I am sure that if we unite to accomplish this task – the disintegration of the bourgeois system – we will have done much, we will have contributed to the development of these objective processes of historical extraction that are imposed on us.

We are fanatics, and fanatics that aim to be always more lucid (\*). And that it is exactly proper for the fanatic, to assume a vision of the world and, that being recognized, of life that is directed towards it, detached from all the effective means to attain it (and therefore ready to utilize them).

Outside of that, there is no other, different perspective. It could only appear under ambiguous and equivocal traits, to those who like to amuse themselves with messianic hopes, to those who are effected by Don Quixotesque sentiments. And, certainly, that is not who we will “convince”, these blind of sight or deaf of hearing, because they are exactly blind and deaf, they are deprived of these natural capabilities and we, on our side, if we have the dispositions of wonder workers, we will even have the possibility – more decisive, and maybe more edifying as well – of constructing robots and leaving to them the conquest of power.

In reality the fact of hearing determined orientations, homogeneous, and clear, the fact of assuming similar points of reference, does not depend – we repeat it – on dialectical hypotheses, but is derived from a priori affinities, of dispositions that we dare to say are transcendental, of vocations that are superior to the simply mental and rational domain – in which at most, if it is “in order”, can (in a solely opaque fashion) reflect them. It is to discover these choices of destiny, to manifest them, to unleash them when they exist, not to create them or fabricate them when they do not.

The appeal addressed to these men who, according to the parliamentary schemes, compose the fringes of the extreme-right of the system, is finished. We, however, we would like to adress those who radically refuse the system, all who lie beyond the left of the regime, certain ones with which we could realize a loyal unity of action in the struggle against bourgeois society (11).

It is true that for them, who do not adhere at all (or support) metaphysical principles, who do not pursue the myth of the true state all, the fact of indicating a superhuman direction, meta-politically and meta-historically and the fact of evoking a superior “reality” by attributing it all the characteristics of truth, will be interpreted as a sublimation, not to say, downright, as a schizophrenic affliction.

But it is true – and above all – that abstraction makes sources of doctrinal derivation – superhuman, meta-politically, meta-historically for us; exclusively human, historical, social for them – the objective that constitutes the political task and animates action in the historical temporal order is the same for both: to destroy the bourgeois system. The identical requirement of organizing life in the state is outside the bourgeois economic dialectic; that poses in the same terms of necessity the aspiration to break the classist structures on which the bourgeoisie bases its domination; that even the same tension of struggle presses and mobilizes the same camps to reintegrate the man – made free by alienating bonds that bourgeois dictatorship imposes on him – into the liberty and dignity that will return to him.

The two camps want to do what must be done: arrive at the outlet. If, for us, the outlet only means having accomplished a part of the voyage, such that for those the voyage is finished (or following other directions), that does not prevent the voyage along the river that must be accomplished by both and the currents that must be surmounted by both.

It takes for one or the other that character of an identical certainty that poses to them the requirement of a loyal strategy of common struggle: without confusion of ranks and roles, but by considering the identity of each. (\*)

And for that, to cut through the bourgeois infection, that one or the other must unite around a common objective of struggle, that they must form a single front of action, by surpassing in a decided fashion all the forms of intellectual dogmatism and by breaking sharply with all manifestations of pseudo-revolutionary complacency. Those are, in effect, what permits the virus of bourgeois society to sterilize in a definitive manner the will to struggle of the revolutionary anti-capitalist forces, and exhausts its energy in abstract and dialectical disputes.

It is necessary, ultimately, that the forces engaged in the unitary struggle against the system for the subversion of the system to summarize their true objectives in a radical fashion. By abandoning the tactics smothered by legalistic bonds or by reformist illusions: without any hesitation – or guilt – before the use of all those drastic and definitive means that conform to battering the obstacles and reclaiming the grandeur of the goal.

It is necessary, in effect, to be persuaded of that: for a political soldier, purity justifies all hardship, disinterest all ruses, such that the impersonal character imprints on the struggle the dissolution of all moralistic preoccupations.

### Disintegration of Freda

the Italian Nazi Maoist Fraca 'Giorgio' Freda is a significant figure in the underground of revolutionary action and thought and is a controversial figure whose ideology attempts to weld together the standard issue leftism of Mao Tse Tung with the standard issue fascism of a Julius Evola (though the latter cannot be said to have been or to be an actual political praxis. However Freda may disagree and he or others may also claim that his ideology is at least a form of Evolan practical politics).

Freda thus is an iconoclastic figure in his racially motivated politics as he employs strategies that are not conventional but that are rather of the Maoist guerrilla type and thus became the prototype of the Louis Beam style 'lone wolf' insurgency form of political praxis within the national Socialist movement. Prior to that point such figures as Corneliu Codreanu and Leon Degrelle played a similar role but within the more conventional political structure of party politics.

Freda drops the party politics approach and recognizes that there is no viable mainstream and legal means of 'disintegrating the system' and thus the approach remaining is that of guerrilla warfare. He differs in his approach and conception of strategy and tactics is that it is not whites alone who will be tearing down the system but a plethora of disenfranchised groups who must focus their antagonism against the common enemy, this being the Zionist-capitalist system.

He fails to acknowledge however that this is the intention of the hidden hand itself to 'collapse the distinction' between diverse groups into a monocultural morass of cultural sewage and submerge all of those under them into this 'cloaca gentium' that they may control the sewer as the 'roi du monde', assuming the messianic role of Rey de reys, the tribalistic mission of Jewry and their masonic and Christian affiliates who have their own conception for how the world should be run.

Thus working with those who seek the common goal of the 'illuminated elites', illuminated with the false light, is a reflection of that false light. However, allowing these other groups to tear down the system may bear fruits of a new harvest, a new world order of a harmonious organic world. Regardless it has its dangers but may be the only alternative, in spite of its risks. That war against the system entails risk, as is entailed in all war and in all life, implies the probability of failure or success and thus must be undergone regardless.

However, Freda strays excessively in the direction of the Third World communist weltanschauung and thus detaches his struggle from any point of transcendence reducing the struggle to a mere economic and crudely materialistic one. This is perhaps a result of his alliances (real or theoretical) and their presumed proximity to his philosophical orientation which is incorporative of close alliances based upon this lowest common denominator quality (that of a form of communism which Freda imputes wrongly to Plato whose Republican model of politics is that of spiritual oligarchy and by no means a leveling equality as in the case of Mao Tse Tung and other Judaized political hacks a hypocritical two-tiered caste system of party member masters and proletarian slaves. In so far as he blunders in this direction he defiles Evola's spiritual orientation by creating a false association between it and irrelevant and conflicting communism which Evola repudiated in so many of his works.

Hence Freda drops the Evolan ball and stumbles as he 'stoops to conquer' on the field of political action, falling from grace, from a potentially higher spiritual stratosphere in the manner of an Evola leading him to misunderstand the political which is necessarily hierarchical and could never be achievable or realizable as an organic state implies hierarchy and authority and one deriving from and oriented around the Divine.

The means to the 'disintegration of the system' is probably insurgency but not necessarily on the part of whites who, being the majority, would be best off sitting on the fence and waiting for other groups to do the dirty work for them. The more power becomes distributed in the system amongst competing groups the more quickly this self assertion of those groups manifests in a will to power leading to overstepping their bounds. The quicker this occurs the quicker the system collapses through fragmentation by insurgency on the part of the more aggressive and perhaps less prudent groups (e.g. the darker variety of non-whites). Hence whites in most cases of the current white created societies would be best off waiting out the collapse of the unsustainable system than placing themselves in the crosshairs of the system and its superlative engines of war and military and police power. However exceptions to the rule may occur and this will be what it will be. Perhaps Freda was speaking more of his own native Italy at the time of his writing the work and his particular context which he did not intend to be extrapolated to contemporary times. This seems doubtful in interpreting the plain meaning of the work however.

One of his platform planks consists of attempting to fuse left and right in a third position attracting the more radical left into the traditional right and distancing himself from the bourgeois right wing-ism of traditional parliamentary democracy which he labels 'bourgeois' and not Tradition. This bourgeois democracy is the very regime he wishes to destroy an appealing to the then 'left' wing of Marxist radicals he deemed a more workable strategy. That may have been true as of that time. But at this present time that truth has faded into a half-truth as the redeem ability of the 'left wing' is much less as it is admittedly far from qualified for any political insurgency and thus would not serve as a worthy recruit base as adversaries of the system at least in the case of the bourgeois pantomimist Marxists or neo-Marxists.

However those of the lower orders not too decimated by drugs and alcohol may have redeemable qualities as they have 'nothing to lose' and therefore 'everything to gain' to 'make the impossible possible' as the anarchist saying goes. In so far Freda has the right approach in reaching those populations, however, he repels the populations of the bourgeois and other castes (assuming the term 'bourgeois' is legitimate which the writer thinks is only of an approximation to truth) who could potentially be of use in funding the cause or in providing intellectual leadership.

However Freda, in his quasi-communist radicalism goes so far in the direction of repelling the 'bourgeois cast' as a windup 'throwing the baby out with the bathwater' and having its own capacity could be something more than a ragtag band of robbers subverted. Such insurgency would undoubtedly fragment and sputter out like a candle in the wind and thus be ineffective, assuming that those who constitute its membership are not adequately able strategists.

Given Freda's template for political paradise in spite of his intellectual merit he demonstrates his utopianism and naivete in his attempt to manifest an impossible political system. Probability, his means would lead not to the preservation of the white race through the disintegration of the system but rather to the disintegration of the white race and not necessarily that of the system which could, given its military might, withstand an onslaught of this possibly inadequate nature.

However, with respect to the bourgeois cast, it has proven as of the time of this writing in 2022, to be unwilling (un)contributors to the white cause as far as the writer can surmise and has allowed the system to disintegrate the white race to a great degree since Freda's writing of 'the disintegration of the system'. In conception of the merchant cast of greed has a tendency to serve itself over the interests of the larger culture organism in the sense of Spengler and Yockey and thus will only support the cause of white survival if it perceives it will receive a return on its investment.

Regardless his utopian conception of political structure and function is an absurdity, an unworkable theoretical house of cards whose instability would lead (if it could ever be built) to as swift collapse, as any other utopian communist conception. Freda goes so far in his 'anti-bourgeois' theoretical pipedream as to advocate the abolition of all schools save those whose curriculum is exclusively related to 'work' which he exalts as the only purpose of existence. This vulgar materialism would make Stalin and perhaps even Lenin blush as it denies all higher 'work' as it relates to art and other higher expressions of consciousness, amounting to a desecration (assuming it would have that force and effect) of the sacred, of tradition, and amounts to as far a divergence from Evola's conceptions as could be conceived.

Freda construes all higher learning (properly and improperly so-called) as 'bourgeois intellectualism'. Though he may be right in some respects as regards the 'vain philosophizing' of so many members of the academe (the acadumb-ick-it sewer system) he nonetheless again 'throws the baby out with the bathwater'. He fails to understand the sacred and the would-be profanation thereof being a distinction not inherently collapsed by contemporary academe as the system relates to purely phenomenal or empirical reality, in so far at least that it does not entail redeemable elements which it does however corrupt and falsify.

The end goal of education and indeed of life Freda poses as 'work', theoretically reducing the higher (Spirit) to the lower and tearing down the (again as a theoretical castle in cloud cuckoo land as this feat would be unattainable) higher principles in man to the level of the brute. He could hardly call himself a devotee or adherent to the teachings of Evola in attempting this unattainable feat but perhaps his other Idiot Mao Tse Tung would be proud of his Italian scion. Hence Freda's conception of an 'organic state' is theoretically absurd as it is not 'organic', does not derive itself from any higher principle and does not look upwards to the stars or within to the soul but downward to the Mire and hence collapses in on itself.

A state oriented around production and consumption, around purely primitive exchange-based relations is not an organic state as it is based only upon the temporal and indeed upon the lowest caste of the temporal (the sudra) and hence cannot be organic as entails (again a theoretical possibility alone and never practicable) an economic myopia and incorporates into itself only the miry clay of crude matter and machines leading to a spiritual darkness.

So far in fact is this conception of Freda as from Evola's that only in the form of insurgent action is there a parallel with Evola, assuming this is a correct interpretation of Evola's work and the Baron advocated that possible course of action.

It would appear as if Evola did in his writings, such as "The Metaphysics of War" however, this is not strictly implied that it manifest in the form of some type of 'lone wolf' or 'small cell' action. However it does not strictly imply that it does not either. Thus the possibility of insurgency exists though whether Evola would endorse in whole or in part Freda's particular form of insurgency with foreign allies is uncertain, but likely and whether he would endorse the 'lone wolf' political praxis in the manner of Maoist guerrilla war is unknown to the writer.

One thing is certain as regards Freda's politics; he is nearer to Mao than Evola and as far from Evola theoretically as possible. Only in the tactical form of 'the disintegration of the system' might Freda's theoretical construct parallel with Evola's and thus reduces simply to a Clausewitzian "Small War" and Che Guevara style applied philosophy and reduces further to the tactics of the guerrilla fighter. However, given the systems power, such tactics would be better left to the non-white ethnic gangs and jihadists than to whites, thereby keeping the white man's hands-free of blood and weakening the system adequately that it may be taken down or indeed become embroiled in international conflict, thus taking the heat off the white population and pro-whites specifically. Perhaps the writer is wrong but only time will tell whether Freda was right, at least as far as his military conception applies. In terms of his aftermath utopia, assuming he could achieve his objective, it would be a ruin indeed and in no way a 'Novum Romanum' but would, amidst the ruins of his insurgency, Herald the death knell of the Pax Romanum, and the advent of the age of lead at the bottom of the cycles of time.